

THE Converted Catholic.

EDITED BY FATHER O'CONNOR.

When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.—Luke xxii., 32.

Vol. V.

NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1888.

No. 8.

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Specially designed for the enlightenment of Roman Catholics and their conversion to Evangelical Christianity.

JAMES A. O'CONNOR, PUBLISHER.

60 Bible House, New York.

Subscription, Per Year, - - - - \$1.00

Single Copies, 10 Cents.

Subscribers can have sample copies sent to friends by forwarding name and address.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as second-class mail matter.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

JESUS CHRIST SAID (JOHN v.: 39-40, revised edition), "Ye search the Scriptures, because ye think that in them ye have eternal life; and these are they which bear witness of me, that ye may have life." And in the sixth chapter, 37-40: "All that which the Father giveth me shall come unto me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out. For I am come down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me. And this is the will of him that sent me, that of all that which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day. For this is the will of my Father, that every one that beholdeth the Son, and believeth on him, should have eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

DURING THE MONTHS OF JUNE AND July we had the privilege of preaching in the following churches in Philadelphia: June 17—In the morning, Salem Methodist Episcopal Church, Lombard street, near Broad street, Rev. Mr. Graff, pastor. In the evening, Tenth United Presbyterian Church, Thirty-

CONTENTS

	PAGE.
Rome and the Papacy.....	226
Young Men's Christian Associations.....	228
Converts from Rome.....	229
Priests Leaving the Roman Catholic Church.....	230
Conversions at Harrison's Meetings.....	230
Convert the Immigrants.....	231
Mother McNulty Will Turn Protestant.....	231
Boston Aroused.....	233
The Pope again in Irish Politics.....	233
Literary Notice.....	234
Roman Catholic Ignorance of the Bible.....	235
Two-Fold Washing.....	238
The Papacy.....	240
Cardinal Gibbons' Influence With President Cleveland.....	243
The Church of Rome Not the Church of Christ.....	244
Good And Kind Letters.....	244
Father O'Connor's Letter to Cardinal Gibbons.....	247
Father O'Connor's Letter to Cardinal Gibbons.....	251

eighth and Hamilton streets, Rev. Mr. Teas, pastor. Rev. Daniel O'Connor, the rector of St. Agatha's Roman Catholic Church, adjoining Mr. Teas' church, is a relative of the writer. One of the assistant priests of St. Agatha's Church was present to hear our discourse. We hope it did him good.

June 24.—In the morning, Western Presbyterian Church, Twentieth and Fitzwater streets, Rev. Dr. McCurdy, pastor.—Afternoon, Reformed Presbyterian Church, Hanover and Oxford streets, Rev. Professor Gailey, pastor.—Evening, Westminster Presbyterian Church, Broad and Fitzwater streets, Rev. Mr. Kirkpatrick, pastor.

July 1,—In the Ninth United Presbyterian Church, Norris Square, Rev. Mr. Crowe, pastor.—Evening, South Presbyterian Church, Third and Redwood streets, Rev. W. L. Ledwith, pastor.

July 12,—In Seventeenth Street Reformed Presbyterian Church.

July 15,—In the morning,—Second United Presbyterian Church, Race, near Sixteenth street, Rev. Dr. Dales, pastor.—Afternoon, Wylie Memorial Church (Presbyterian), Broad street, Rev. Dr. Wylie, pastor.

July 22,—In the morning, Union Presbyterian Church, Thirteenth street, near Spruce, Rev. Mr. Gamble, pastor.—Evening, St. George's Methodist Episcopal Church, Fourth street, near Race, Rev. Dr. Carson, pastor.

July 29,—In the morning, Fifth United Presbyterian Church, Twentieth street, near Spring Garden street.—In Reformed Presbyterian Church, Nineteenth and Federal streets.

August 5,—In the morning, Frankford United Presbyterian Church, Rev. Dr. Kyle, pastor.—Evening, Wharton Street Presbyterian Church, Rev. Mr. Smiley, pastor.

Rome and the Papacy.

From the Philadelphia Inquirer, July 23, 1888.

Rev. James A. O'Connor, the converted Roman Catholic priest, addressed a large audience yesterday in the Union Presbyterian Church, on Thirteenth street, below Spruce. Father O'Connor, as he is still called by members of the church from which he has withdrawn, has entirely banished from his personal appearance any of the characteristics of the priestly aspect. He wears a full beard, and makes a liberal display of shirt bosom, collar and cuffs, looking as neat as if he had just stepped out of a band box. He has a pleasant face, a frank, manly manner, an engaging smile and a gift of continuance, to which he himself good-naturedly referred yesterday, admitting to the congregation that he had preached fifteen minutes beyond the time he had allowed himself, and promising never to do so again in that church, "inasmuch," said he, "as it is highly improbable that I shall ever again have the pleasure of addressing you."

After a brief doctrinal introduction on the mediatorial office of Christ, the good father took up his specialty, remarking that what he found fault with the Church of Rome was that it was not satisfied with Christ as a mediator and intercessor, but sought others, so that while Christ was not actually ignored, the Virgin was prayed to, and the saints were prayed to, to such an extent that amounted to setting Christ aside. The idea of motherhood renders it, perhaps natural, he continued, that Mary should be called upon to intercede, and the tendency of humanity to seek human sympathy shows itself in the appeals to the saints. What seems most tangible

is laid hold of, and for one prayer that is offered to Christ one hundred are offered to the Virgin and the saints.

Such is the doctrine that every priest has to teach. Such was the doctrine that I taught while I was a priest myself. Practically then, as the mediator who ever liveth to make intercession for us, Christ is set aside. The people go astray after strange gods, and pass by the only way which God has pointed out. The Roman Catholic believes in the Church; the Christian, the Protestant if you will, believes he is saved by God's free grace and mercy, in Jesus Christ; God has called him, and written his name forever in the book of life. He pleads always and only the merits of Jesus Christ, and as God is faithful, he that places his hands in the hand of of Jesus and asks to be led unto the presence of his Heavenly Father, will surely reach there.

In the course of his remarks Mr. O'Connor said his position was like that of Luther, and he felt conscientiously bound to adhere to it. He stated that he was continually in the receipt of letters from Roman Catholics, laymen and women, priests and nuns, asking for information about the truth he was preaching. He personally knew that within a comparatively short period 800 members of the Roman Catholic Church had gone into Protestant communions. He had not attempted on his own part to establish a new denomination. Several reasons determined him in pursuing that course, one of which was that the members of such a congregation would be boycotted. He knew a baker, who, in consequence of attending his preaching and leaving the Roman Catholic Church, was boycotted at every bakery

in New York, and was obliged to travel off to New Orleans in search of employment.

He referred to Father McGlynn's remark when he first heard of his work. "A man I have no respect for," said the worthy doctor, "if he wants to attack the Church why doesn't he join one of the Protestant denominations?" Since then, however, Dr. McGlynn had advanced considerably and now they stood on the same ground in reference to the Papacy, though each had his own peculiar work to do. For Dr. McGlynn's politics and his land theories, said Mr. O'Connor, I care nothing. These are temporal interests that will pass away. My work, in God's providence, is to hold up before the souls of men Christ and Him crucified, the Sacrifice for our sins, the Mediator between God and man, the living Intercessor for His people.

Before closing the speaker referred to an intimation which had been thrown out that he might be expected to speak of the conversion of a nun whom he was said to have helped to escape from a convent. He was sorry if anybody was likely to be disappointed, but such matters were altogether private, and he was not in the habit of making them subjects of public discussion. A little reflection would show that as a question of good taste alone, it would not be proper to bring a topic of that nature into an address delivered before a general audience. Elder McIntyre followed up the remarks of Mr. O'Connor with a brief speech commending the work of Mr. O'Connor as one that every Protestant American should sustain, one that was evidently blessed by Almighty God and would redound to His glory.

Young Men's Christian Associations and Our "Free List."

The recently issued Year Book of the Young Men's Christian Association gives the number of Associations in the United States and Canada as 1,204. The reading rooms of every one of these Associations are attended by numbers of Roman Catholics. They read the daily papers, monthly magazines and other periodicals. They never, or hardly ever, look at a religious publication, nor do they attend the religious meetings of the Associations. Their Church teaches them that it would be a mortal sin, entailing the loss of their souls, to do so. But wherever they find THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC they eagerly peruse it. This we have learned from many Catholics after conversion, and from the secretaries of the Associations who have written to us requesting that the magazine be sent to the Association rooms regularly. Rarely does a subscription accompany such requests, "because there is no money in the treasury." We try to supply all as best we can, but it is manifest that we could not comply with requests from all the Associations. Our "Free List" is growing so large that unless our friends come to our assistance it will throw us into bankruptcy. So far we have not refused any request for free copies of the magazine or the tracts that we publish, and we thank God for having been able to send out so much pure Christian literature on this ugly Roman question. Great good has been done, and we want our subscribers who have means for the work of the Lord in this part of His vineyard to be sharers in this good. The work needs money as well as brains and the grace of God. We have the

best constituency that any publication could desire and they are a Godly people. Many of them have not been blessed with overmuch of this world's goods and cannot help us as they desire. But we appeal to those who have the power to help, to extend the circulation of the magazine where it will do good. In years to come, if we live and are able to labor, we hope the paid subscription list will be so large as to make such an appeal as this unnecessary.

The Rev. James A. O'Connor, the converted Roman Catholic priest of New York, who has been preaching the gospel to Roman Catholics there for nine years with great success, preached in Philadelphia, last Sabbath, in Rev. Dr. Dales' Church, and in Dr. Wylie's Memorial Church. He had large congregations on both occasions, who were greatly interested in his discourses.—*Philadelphia Presbyterian*, July 21, 1888.

THE STATUE TO GENERAL GARIBALDI, erected in Washington Square, in this city, which formed the subject of the "Letter to Cardinal Gibbons," last month, had the effect on the Roman Catholic editors that a red flag is supposed to exercise on a mad bull. They shrieked out for its destruction. "It is an outrage on the Catholics of New York" said the *Catholic Review*, "that such a statue should be allowed to stand there. It should come down." At this writing it has not been defaced, but it would not at all surprise us if some fanatic, inspired by the Papal organs, should attempt to destroy it. However, if they should be so foolish a finer statue will take its place.

 CONVERTS ÷ FROM ÷ ROME.

PERALTA, N. M., March 17, 1888.

LETTER TO MONSIGNOR PRESTON.

DEAR BROTHER IN CHRIST:—Enclosed find \$1.00 for which please send me THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC for this year, and please excuse me for not renewing my subscription sooner, for I was trying to get some subscribers to your valuable magazine, but most of people here cannot read English and those who can are not able to pay the subscription, as times are very hard now in this part of the country. As for me, I assure you I cannot be without your magazine which gives such joyful news of so many converts from Rome, I being myself a convert from the teachings of that Church. Last year, Brother Harwood, the superintendent of the M. E. Church in New Mexico, made me a present of one year's subscription to THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, and I value it as the best present he could have made me. I will be in future, God willing, your constant subscriber, and help you, whenever I can, to get new subscribers. Praying the Lord for your success in your work to bring Roman Catholics to the true Gospel of Christ.

I remain, yours in the faith of Christ,

MRS. T—C—.

NEW YORK CITY.

DEAR BROTHER:—“Though lost to sight to memory dear”—I send you a copy of a letter which I wrote to Monsignor Preston and mailed to-day. You may find it useful as the expression of the honest convictions of an American converted Catholic.

Miss K. G—.

..... I love my God and my country, and since I left the Church of Rome for the true Catholic Church after Christ's teachings I have a record that I am proud of. You have in this city the priest for whom I did all I could in my girlish way to get money to build St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church in West Thirty-second street. But as he did not do right I left his church. His meanness, however, has made him your associate vicar-general.

The more I read my Bible, the more I love to work for the true welfare, both spiritual and temporal, of my brothers and sisters, and if you can serve two masters, it is more than I can do, for the Church of Rome is not the Church of Christ.

In the name of the Holy Trinity read the following passages in the Bible:—Jeremiah xvii: 5; Matthew xxiii: 9; John xxii: 18, 19.

I am praying for you all, but more especially for Father McGlynn and Sister McNulty, of St Elizabeth's Hospital in West Thirty-first street, and by God's help I shall do all I can to lead Roman Catholics in the right way. The foreign Pope cannot make us believe that his Church is right and the Church of Christ wrong. But we true Americans will take God for our Father, Jesus Christ for our High Priest and Mediator, the Holy Ghost for our Teacher, and the Bible for our guide; and we will defend the liberty which our God has given us against our spiritual and temporal enemies.

This comes to you from a true American convert of Irish parentage.

Priests Leaving the Roman Catholic Church.

The London *Christian*, July 6, 1888, says in its editorial notes:—"It is stated that of the Presbyterian ministers in the United States and Canada over fifty were formerly Roman Catholic priests, and that the same may be said of a large number of Methodist ministers, and members of the Protestant Episcopal Church."

To this may be added that many former ecclesiastics of the Church of Rome are preachers in the Baptist and Congregational bodies. THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC has published addresses, letters and Christian testimonies from many of these brethren, and it hopes to publish many more. During our visit to Philadelphia last month we had the pleasure of meeting Rev. J. R. Thompson, D. D., Vancouver, Washington Territory, who informed us that one of the members of his Presbytery was formerly a Roman Catholic priest. Dr. Thompson is a bishop without the title in the Presbyterian Church in that far distant territory. He is also President of the Territorial Legislature. He gave us many interesting details about this former priest, and we rejoiced to learn that he was an excellent man and of great promise. Indeed Catholic priests, when converted, are usually conservative men and preachers of sound doctrine. When not converted, that is, when there is no spiritual change in their lives, they are no better or worse than other men in like positions.

In reply to the inquiry of a subscriber (J. H. S.) in New Haven, Conn., we answer that more than thirty priests and Roman ecclesiastics have been con-

verted in the last few years, to our personal knowledge. Some of them are preaching, some are in the professions, and some are in business—all first class men. A great many others have left the Roman Church who have not made much of a mark in life. Indeed the struggles of a priest to get along after he leaves the Roman Church are very hard. He has not only the world to face, like other men, but he has been brought up without any business training and has lived an unnatural, unreal life; and, what is hardest of all, he has to contend against the bitter opposition and denunciation of all his former friends and acquaintances. There are none to give him a push in the world, and many of his former Protestant friends look coldly upon him. Even such a well known priest as Father Edward McGlynn, who had hundreds of Protestant friends two years ago, has suffered in this respect. Right or wrong, people think he ought to have remained in "the Church" and there fight the good fight of American independence of Papal Tyranny. But the Church of Rome will not allow independent self-respecting priests to stay in it and exercise their natural rights as men and citizens. It demands the obedience of slaves, not the services of free men. Father McGlynn's eloquent address (in the "Letters to Cardinal Gibbons") shows why he did not go to Rome.

When all the difficulties are considered, it is truly marvelous that so many priests are leaving the Roman Church.

Conversions at Harrison's Meetings.

A correspondent in New York city, reports, June 20, the remarkable con-

version of Michael Cregan, an Irish Roman Catholic of the famous Ninth ward of New York. It occurred at revival services conducted by Rev. Thomas Harrison, "the boy preacher" at the 18th Street Methodist Episcopal Church where 1800 were converted. At one of the meetings Cregan arose and said: "Friends, you all know Michael Cregan, the Roman Catholic. Well, I have heard of religion all my life, but never knew what it was until now. I have been a very wicked man, as many of you know, but now, O blessed Jesus, I give up everything to Thee! I give up drinking, swearing, and every manner of wickedness, and belong to Jesus Christ, who has purchased me at a great price—even His own blood." Mr. Cregan's wife also attended the meetings and was converted, as were a great many other Catholics.

Convert the Immigrants.

According to the *New York Sun*, July 15, 1888, 35,550 Italians landed at Castle Garden in one month, June 10 to July 12. As Mayor Hewitt said in a brief address on the Fourth of July, when distributing to the successful competitors the prizes offered by Colonel Elliott F. Shepard, editor of the *Mail and Express*, for the best stories and poems about Independence Day—"The class of immigrants now coming to our shores are so much inferior to those of past years they are a positive danger to our institutions." Persons in their condition will not scruple to sell their votes, and when political parties are so evenly balanced, a few hundred votes may decide a Presidential election. The salvation of the country depends on converting such voters.

Mother McNulty Will Turn Protestant.

For many months past the case of St. Elizabeth's Hospital, on West Thirty-first street, New York, has lain dormant in the courts, and very little publicity has been given to the matter. The case is as follows: Monsignor Preston, Archbishop Corrigan's right-hand man in every piece of dirty work, has brought suit against Mother McNulty to oust her from the ownership and control of the hospital, which is a very valuable property consisting of two buildings five stories high. It was founded thirty years ago by a number of lay persons who agreed to pay twenty-five cents a month and were to receive hospital treatment of the best kind in case of sickness. Mrs. McNulty was most active in collecting funds, and it was chiefly through her exertions that the hospital was built. When completed she was installed its superioress. Now, "the Church" wants it, and Mother McNulty will not give up the fruits of her labors. Speaking on the subject she said: "There is not an archbishop or priest in New York that has any claim upon the hospital. If it was a poor shanty with a heavy mortgage upon it they would not go to all this trouble to get possession of it. I worked hard for thirty years, and I am now asked to step out and let strangers walk in. I won't do it. With all their law I could settle the whole matter in half an hour, but I won't do it. Many of the old members, most of them now dead or scattered, gave me one hundred, two hundred, and three hundred dollars to build up this place, and would it be right for me to surrender it to strangers? I worked very hard,

and often after a heavy day's toil I went out and all over at night and collected for it. Dr. McGlynn and Father Brann delivered lectures for it, and I struggled in every way to establish this place and make it what it is. And now I am told to walk out. While we were struggling we were let alone, but now that prosperity had come the church wants it. But it has no more right to it than it has to Vanderbilt's mansion. The third order of St. Francis, under which the hospital is organized is not a religious order, strictly speaking, but is for lay people who perform certain religious duties for the good of their souls, and to mutually assist, help and comfort each other, as any other benevolent society does. The property belongs to those who worked for it and who paid their money, and not to the church."

When the hospital was established Mother McNulty selected a number of contributors to act as nurses and servants, and though they were called "Sisters," they received regular wages out of the profits of the institution. By her skilful management the hospital was very successful, and then the eyes of "the Church"—Corrigan, Preston and the other members of the ecclesiastical "ring" in New York City—were turned upon it. They wanted to put Mother McNulty out, but she would not go. As the hospital is in the Holy Innocents parish, which is cared for by Father Larkin, he sent the board of trustees of that church to call upon Mother McNulty. The trustees announced to her that they had come to take charge of the hospital, but she told them she did not recognize them at all. They then put to her a number of questions, such as if she claimed to own the property, etc. "I have telegraphed for

my lawyer," she answered. "He will soon be here and will answer your questions. I decline." Lawyer Edward Stevens arrived some minutes later, and soon after the trustees left, convinced that Mother McNulty knew what she was about and was fully resolved to maintain her position. Next morning Father Dougherty, one of Father Larkin's assistants, called and told Mother McNulty that she would be excommunicated. "Very well," she replied, "I can turn Protestant." "But do you want to lose your soul?" asked the priest. "Oh, no," answered the Mother, "God never damned any one for standing out for his own. If I become a Protestant it isn't I who will lose my soul, but those who will force me to it will lose their souls." Father Dougherty gave up the theological discussion.

Soon after this, Monsignor Preston imported two sisters from Allegheny, Pa., to take charge of the hospital. Mother McNulty would not allow them to stay. Corrigan and Preston threatened excommunication and several other Papal penalties, but Mother McNulty held the fort. Finally the "blessed sacrament" was removed from the altar, and all priests were forbidden to say mass in the institution or give absolution to the inmates. There are several lawsuits pending, one of which is for the dissolution of the order, which consists of Mother McNulty and a few attached friends. Corrigan and Preston recognize that they have no legal claim, but they hope by their interdicts and excommunications to freeze her out. This is a plain case of "boycotting," and we propose to call the attention of the Pope to the matter. He has condemned boycotting in Ireland. Will he do the same in this case?

 Boston Aroused.

At the Bible Conference conducted by Dr. L. W. Munhall, Rev. Geo. C. Needham, Rev. Dr. Moorhead, of Xenia College, Ohio, and others at Ocean Grove, N. J., July 25-31, we had a long conversation with Professor L. T. Townsend, of Boston University, on the present agitation in Boston regarding the public schools. The Church of Rome is so powerful in Boston, and indeed in all New England, that, as we have again and again pointed out, not only is liberty in danger there, but life is rendered unendurable. In our next issue we shall treat at length of this present agitation and the great meetings that have been held in Faneuil Hall and Tremont Temple. For the present we will only quote one sentence of Professor Townsend's address in Faneuil Hall: "The principal of our High School has been dismissed for teaching the truth of history regarding indulgences, another principal has become a Roman Catholic, and one of our female teachers has recently consulted me three times as to the advisability of becoming a Roman Catholic, to retain her position in the school."

 The Pope again in Irish Politics.

The Pope has sent another letter to the Irish Bishops, which was read in all the Roman Catholic churches in Ireland on Sunday, July 15. He said his rescript condemning "Boycotting" and the "Plan of Campaign" must be obeyed. With fine sarcasm Archbishop Walsh, of Dublin, who was forced on the Pope by the Land Leaguers, introduced this second Papal letter in the

following manner:

"His Holiness, as you will observe, has addressed this letter to us with the view, in the first place, of removing a painful misconception which seems to have arisen in the minds of some in connection with the recent decree of the Holy Office to those who have not personal knowledge of the warmth and depth of the paternal affection of our Holy Father for the Irish Church and for its faithful children. It may, indeed, seem strange that the Sovereign Pontiff, the successor of the Prince of Apostles, the vicar upon earth of our Lord himself, should condescend to address us as His Holiness has done in this most memorable letter, for in it he seeks, as it were, to justify himself in our eyes, explaining to us with patient care the true bearing of the recent decree, and protesting with most earnest emphasis against that reproach, which has so deeply wounded his paternal heart that he is wanting in sympathy with the people of Ireland in their present trials."

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, is the name of a monthly magazine of 32 pages, published by James A. O'Connor, 60 Bible House, New York city. \$1.00 per year. THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC is edited by Father O'Connor who is a converted priest. The editor well understands the nature, aims and objects of the Roman Catholic Church, and he exposes them in a christian spirit, condemning the system but endeavoring to lead those deluded by Romish superstition to the only one who can forgive sin. The May, June and July numbers are full of facts and truths which every Catholic ought to know, and which every Protestant will do well to learn.—*Chicago Free Methodist*, July 4, 1888.

Literary Notice.

BY

REV. W. R. GORDON, S. T. D.

MANHASSET, L. I.

One Year at St. Margaret's: or Grace Dabney's Experiment. Thomas Whittaker, Bible House, N. Y. Price, \$1.25.

This is an admirable book on a vitally important subject. Its running title is the more readily suggestive: "The American convent as a school for Protestant children." Because its subject is not likely to grow less in importance, we are not surprised that it has reached its sixth edition within as many years. The narrative is "the commonplace and every day experience of a few Protestant girls, kept for the most part outside of the curtain which conceals the *secrets* of Roman Catholic convents in this country. It is engaging, convincing, instructive; and its verisimilitude covers all the facts in the case of an education imparted to Protestant children in these dangerous schools, where many well-meaning parents, ignorant of what they are doing, place their children, misguided by the false impression that they will receive all the advantage of a superior education imparted by teachers eminently qualified for the purpose. There never was a more mischievous delusion. Although such parents are always assured by absolute promises that "the religious principles of their children shall never be meddled with," they are grossly deceived by the cunning blandishment of the most imposing hypocrisy.

Just how it is done, this very useful book makes known. All that Protestant children are required to do, is to *conform to the rules of the school*; which when *done*, the painful issue will be realized in the perversion of innocent victims of imposture, and in the grief of

guilty parents, thus unwittingly made the greatest enemies of their own confiding offspring. Let all Protestant parents procure and read this book, because it will serve to guard them from exposing their children to a seductive and atrocious influence, exactly adapted to ruin them mentally and morally.

In the Preface it is well said: "Never before has the Roman Church put forth such efforts as it is now making to secure to itself the control of our country; and with its usual consummate strategy, it has seized on education, by which to effect its object."

Female Jesuits do promise not to interfere with the religion of Protestant children, committed to their schools; but what say they, who, as bishops and priests, write to their "missionary patrons," as to this specific matter? The following quotation is from a report of the General Convention of the whole Roman Catholic Church in the United States, held in Baltimore years ago, and circulated in Europe, a copy of which accidentally fell into the hands of a Protestant gentleman travelling in Europe, who sent it home for the edification of his friends.

"Mr. Flaget has established in his diocese many convents of nuns devoted to the education of young females. Catholics and Protestants are admitted indiscriminately. The latter, after having finished their education, return to the bosom of their families, full of esteem for their instructresses. They are very ready to refute the calumnies which the jealousy of heretics loves to spread against the religious communities; and often when they have no opposition of their parents to fear, they embrace the Catholic religion."—[*Quarterly Register*, Vol. 2, 1820, p. 194.

ROMAN CATHOLIC IGNORANCE OF THE BIBLE.

BY LEO REED.

IT was amusing to find a leading Protestant journal of this city some time since, gravely expressing, editorially, an apprehension lest the Catholic Church should take advantage of a recent legal decision in this state and introduce her own Bible into the public schools of the districts in which her adherents are in the majority. The Catholic Church is not yet ready to commit suicide. Her dread of the Bible is not confined to the King James version. The Douay Bible, perverted as it is, and filled with misleading notes, is yet to the Church an object of distrust and aversion. In her parochial schools and colleges her control is unquestioned and there the Douay Bible is never seen. It is claimed that the Scriptures are dangerous reading to the young. So they have "histories" of the Bible in which the "dangerous" parts are carefully omitted. The teachers at least might be supposed to find the safe way through the pits and quicksands of the terrible book. But the same solicitous care is exercised toward them. I have repeatedly questioned sisters on this point and they invariably answer that the Bible is never read in the convent. In her theological seminaries the Bible in the dead languages only is permitted, so only the most advanced students can at all understand it, but the systematic study of the Scriptures, as practiced by Protestants, is unknown there.

Nor does the Bible fare any better in the religious service of Romanism. Non-Catholics, who for the first time listen to a Catholic sermon often think

it but little different from what they hear in a Protestant church. The priest reads a portion of Scripture and in his sermon occasionally refers to God's Word. But the book before the priest is not the Bible. It contains merely *selections* from Scripture for every Sabbath and festival of the year. Precisely the same verses, not one word more or less, are read on the same day in every Catholic church the world over. At the end of the year the priest turns to the first page of his book and repeats the same thing for each occasion. The selections were made centuries ago, so that what was read on Easter-Sunday in London or Paris, a hundred years ago, was repeated there last Easter-Sunday and will be a hundred years hence. The dangerous element, it will be seen, is everywhere pretty well suppressed.

The priest is compelled, under penalty of mortal sin, to devote about an hour every day to his breviary, a production of the dark ages and largely a repository of grotesque tales of saints and miracles. But the servant of Rome is nowhere required to read the Bible.

In fact, with his brain filled with the fantasies of the breviary, he cannot be expected to study God's Word.

A few years ago the Plenary Council of Baltimore in a long pastoral letter briefly commended to the faithful the reading of Scripture. Those few words were seized upon by many Protestants as the evidence of a better spirit in the Catholic Church. Fond illusion! With her growing power in this country the Church shows more and more the cloven hoof, but as yet the policy of her

sagacious leaders is to disarm by pretensions the suspicions and the hostility of Protestantism. Toward such a purpose, nothing was better calculated, as the event proved, than an exhibition of love for the Bible, while the admonition to Catholics, being urged no further, was harmless and soon forgotten. Ask any Catholic and he will tell you that never before or since the third council of Baltimore has he been directed from the pulpit, in the confessional, or in any other way, to read the Bible.

In consequence of the attitude of the Church toward the Bible, Catholics high and low are deplorably ignorant not only of its contents but as to what it really is. That the Bible is God's Word and therefore in authority as much above the word of men as God is above men is beyond their comprehension. Hence the average Catholic, whether priest or layman, if indeed he at all troubles himself about the matter, is, as a rule, hostile to the Scriptures. When a boy of about thirteen years, I was employed for some time at the house of a well-to-do Protestant family. On one occasion, being alone in a room, my curiosity was attracted by a small book on the floor. A glance showed it to be a testament, the property, no doubt, of one of the children. Promptly I threw it into the fire burning in an open grate. Now I had never been instructed to burn Bibles should opportunity offer. Neither did I then know that my Church in the past had made it her business to burn not only Bibles, but readers of the Bible as well, and that she would do so now were the power not lacking. But I was a dutiful son of Holy Mother Church and I had imbibed my share of her spirit. It

never entered my mind to accuse myself of that act in the confessional. I thought I had rendered an acceptable service to the Lord.

A Protestant clergyman, who was for a number of years a Catholic priest, in a recent conversation on this subject informed me that not long before leaving the Church he made a pastoral visit to all the families of his numerous congregation. He found a Bible in one family and in one other an unused and dust-covered copy of the Old Testament. This gentleman gave it as his experience that Catholics generally regard the Scriptures somewhat like they would an antiquated, mathematical work, correct enough perhaps, but quite unintelligible and out of date.

Some years ago I had use for a Do-uay Testament. I visited a leading Catholic bookstore in this city and a boy probably fourteen years of age came forward to wait on me. "I wish to look at a copy of the New Testament," I said to him. "New Testament?" replied the young clerk with a puzzled expression, "that is a law book isn't it?" turning toward some shelves of legal works. "No, no, the New Testament," I repeated. "Testament, testament, why of course that is a law book," concluded the youth, and over he went to the shelves and commenced to examine the legal titles. Presently a man came forward from whom I got the book.

An old Catholic lady on a visit at my house noticed a Bible about one of the rooms on a Sabbath afternoon. "That is a book," she said to my wife, "which I would not permit about my home. It is a bad thing for children." "Why," she was answered, "that is not a bad book. Do you remember what the priest read when you attended church

this morning?" The old lady repeated the substance of what she had heard, and my wife turning to the place in the Bible handed it to her. She read the verses indicated and expressed her surprise in finding them the same as the "gospel" the priest had read. The old lady's opposition to the Bible arose, of course, not from a knowledge of it, but merely from what she had been taught.

Not long since, I became acquainted with a young man who had studied for the priesthood and who had spent several years at St. Vincent College. He showed me a Greek Bible, which is used at that institution, but he was amazed at various passages in the Douay Bible in English to which I called his attention, and of which he had never heard before. Only a few months ago I met a Catholic gentleman who was with me a student at St. Vincent's sixteen years ago. The conversation turned on religious subjects and I quoted to him a few passages from Scripture inconsistent with his religion. "Yes, I know," he admitted, "there are some things in the Bible *which should not be there.*" In this frank statement he, perhaps unaware, defined exactly the position of his Church. She is supreme and the Almighty should not command anything which conflicts with her authority.

A Catholic lady, educated at the parochial schools of this city, and of fully average intelligence, in conversing on this subject, startled me by the question, deliberately and seriously put, "What does the Bible say about Luther?"

PITTSBURGH, July 16, 1888.

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC will be sent from July until the end of the year for 50 cents.

Rev. Jas. A. O'Connor, a converted Roman Catholic priest, who has been laboring for the past nine years among the Roman Catholics of New York city, with much success, having been instrumental in bringing many hundreds out from that corrupt Church, and among these several priests, who are now like himself, preaching Jesus Christ as the only Mediator, is now in our city by invitation. He preached in three of our churches to very large congregations last Sabbath and presented very forcibly the mission in which he is engaged, soliciting the prayers and assistance of those favorable to the work. Having no salary or regular contributions to carry on his work, he is dependent on the voluntary contributions of those who are awake to the necessity of such a work as he is engaged in.—*Philadelphia Presbyterian Journal*, June 28, 1888.

Father O'Connor, an ex-Roman Catholic priest of New York city and editor of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, occupied the pulpit yesterday morning in the Ebenezer Evangelical Church, and a large audience was attracted thither by the announcement that he was to preach. Father O'Connor is an eloquent speaker and very earnest in manner. While referring to his conversion to the Protestant faith he did not enter into any loud denunciation of the Roman Catholic religion, being satisfied by telling his hearers that he did not regard the latter as the true doctrine. Father O'Connor commanded the closest attention of the audience.

Last evening he preached in St. Paul's Lutheran Church, and this evening he will give a free lecture in the Court House.—*Allentown, Pa., Chronicle and News*, July 9, 1888.

Two-Fold Washing.

BY MRS. GEO. C. NEEDHAM.

"If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." Jno. xiii, 8.

I wish to call the sober attention of both Protestants and Roman Catholics to the consideration of this important subject.

Two forms of washing are constantly presented in the Word; the one illustrated by the external purifying of such impervious vessels as earthen pots and brazen cups; the other by the internal cleansing of garments, into the fabric of which the water thoroughly permeates. Two types of purity are likewise unfolded in Scriptures; the whitewashed sepulcher, which is beautiful without, but full of corruption within; and the snow-drift, which is fair and clean throughout. So, also, two expressive words are found in the Old Testament, and two in the New, descriptive of the two washings which affect these special results.

David, in the fifty-first Psalm employs the stronger of these terms when he cries out, "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin. . . Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." Abraham uses the other word, when saying to the two angels at Mamre, "Wash your feet, and rest yourselves under the tree." (Gen. xviii. 4).

In the Scripture before us, our Lord was teaching the Pharisees that they scrupulously observed the external, while they entirely ignored the internal cleansing. In their intense exactness to fulfill the letter, they had killed the

Spirit of the commandment. Their religion had degenerated to hollow ceremonies; and those same rites which had been imposed of God as tangible outward reminders of internal spiritual realities, they had exalted till the truth was lost to apprehension, and only the empty type remained.

Most clearly is the doctrine of a two-fold washing taught in John xiii. Jesus knew that the cross was imminent. His hour had come. Yet no consideration of self, no shrinking at the shame and suffering, distracts His mind from the needs of those he is about to leave as orphans. The same love which constrained Him to forsake the glory and riches of the Father's throne, pervaded his soul to the end. By one last act of priestly anticipation, He is to teach his disciples the profound mystery of soul-cleansing. Already He had spoken to them of the blood of atonement and the water of sanctification. But lest they have failed to comprehend, He gives this final illustration of his power to put away the defilement of sin.

Provided with the basin and towel, He stoops to perform the common servant's duty. Some of the disciples, it would appear, submit to the act in silence, discerning nothing in it beyond a fresh and possibly surprising exhibition of their Lord's condescending kindness. But Peter, thanks to his warm, blundering heart, remonstrates with genuine indignation at such dishonor to his Master. "*Never*, not to all eternity, shalt THOU my feet wash!" Jesus answered him, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me" (not *in* me). Simon Peter saith unto him, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." If there

be anything in this washing which I fail to comprehend, let me have it fully, without stint. Ah, Peter, we must praise thee that thy very mistakes drew from the Lord such explanations as have edified and rejoiced the Church throughout the ages!

Now, up to this stage in the remarkable proceeding, but one word has been used in the controversy between the Master and his disciples—that word which expresses a partial or external washing. But immediately in response to Peter's vehement refusal, the Saviour changes his mode of expression for a term which signifies thorough and internal cleansing. Jesus saith unto him, "He that is **BATHED**, needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit; and ye are clean (bathed), but not all." For he knew who should betray him, therefore said He, "ye are not all clean." The feet of Judas had been washed with the others, but, having no part in the atoning blood of Christ, it could not be said of him that he was bathed from his sins.

This beautiful incident has its important teaching for every believer: "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin" (1 John i. 7). It is the present and complete ground of full justification and sanctification (Rom. v. 9; Heb. x. 10). But the person so saved, and so standing, has two natures. And these are antagonistic, the one to the other. (Gal. v. 18). Isaac was born into the family, a child of promise; but Ishmael, the son of the flesh, remained his mocking adversary, never changed, but finally thrust out.

This old nature continually inclines to sin, and we need to be daily washed from its defiling power. "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and

the truth is not in us" (1 John i. 8). From the wounded side of the smitten Christ flowed forth blood and water—emblematic of the blood of the atonement, which purges the soul once and forever, and of the Word of truth, which, by the Spirit, continually discovers and brings to confession daily sins (xx. 3; 1 John i. 7). "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." Under the old dispensation the blood of the Lamb atoned for general sin; but the ashes of the red heifer removed particular defilement. (Num. xix). Thus the past cross and the present mercy-seat sustain to one another intimate and intricate relations. Upon the brazen altar blood was shed. Upon the golden ark the blood was sprinkled. At one place atonement was begun; at the other it was perpetuated. The Levites were all personally atoned for by blood at the brazen altar. But they were cleansed from the defilements of service at the laver of water. "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins" (1 John ii. 1, 2).

No need for other advocates, angelic or human. If Jesus pleads our cause, what an insult to Him if we appeal to others, thereby proving our lack of confidence in His all-prevailing intercession, and His all-sufficient provision made for the entire removal of sins, guilt, and defilement. It is the essence of impiety to seek salvation from Mary or Peter or the Pope. Neither Mary nor Peter would have it so. They would have us ascribe all the glory alone to Jesus. It was thus with them and all the saints on earth. It is so now in heaven.

THE PAPACY.

Its Present Position, Policy and Prospects.

BY REV. J. A. WYLIE, LL. D., AUTHOR OF THE "HISTORY OF PROTESTANTISM". ETC.

III.

ONE TREMENDOUS MECHANISM.

There is another weapon for the coming conflict to which I can refer in only a single sentence: I refer to the INFALLIBILITY. The decree of the Infallibility (1870) throws its shield over all the Popes of past ages; over all the bulls and edicts of past ages; over all the pontifical doings of past ages; over all the *ex-cathedra* utterances of past ages, and the Syllabus among the rest—which it declares "infallible." In that Syllabus Pius IX. teaches that the Popes of former days in their public transactions with kings and nations never exceeded by a hair's breadth their just rights and prerogatives. The present Pope in an Encyclical not yet a year old, expressed his approval of the Syllabus. But surely the man who justifies as right and righteous all the doings of the Papacy in the past—the excommunication of kings; the overthrow of governments; the interdicts on nations; and the crusades against religion—is prepared to renew all these atrocities in the future whenever the time shall be fitting. There can be no uncharitableness in believing this.

But we have here to do with the "Infallibility" as an instrument to work with. It gives tenfold power to the Pope's hand. The Infallibility it is that gathers up all the instrumentalities we have enumerated above; combines them into one tremendous mechanism; and makes the working of that mechanism swift and crushing. It strikes with the promptitude and power of omnipo-

tence. Take a moment's survey of it.

At the summit sits the Pope, divine and infallible. Immediately below the Pontiff come some thousand bishops, all of whom are sworn to obey him; below the bishops come hundreds of thousands of priests, and hundreds of thousands of monks and nuns; with a machinery of schools, colleges, and confessionals. Below the priests come millions and millions of devotees, dispersed over all the countries of the globe. From the mount of infallibility goes forth the fiat. It descends to the rank below. These send it on to the more numerous ranks below them; and these to the yet more numerous rank beneath; and so on to the base; and thus it goes on, widening and widening, till it sets a world in motion. Of all these millions the Pope is the master. But has the Pope himself no master? Yes, he has a master; and that master is the Society of Jesus. Behind his throne stand in shadow the sons of Loyola. The Pope is simply the mouth through which the Jesuits speak—the hand by which they execute their deeds; and be the crime they prompt ever so enormous, he must issue the order for its perpetration, or prepare the robe and ring which are used at the funerals of Popes. The Pope cannot abdicate. The man who once sits down in the fatal chair of St. Peter can never again leave it, till he is carried from it a corpse; for, should he demit his office, he would find a Jesuit waiting for him with a cup of poison at the foot of the

steps of his throne.

PROGRESS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

After this bird's eye view of the Papacy in Europe, let us inquire, WHAT POSITION HAS IT OBTAINED AMONG OURSELVES? Great Britain is the head of the world. If the Papacy shall succeed in restoring its dominion in Great Britain, it will by the same act restore it all over the earth. This is its grand ambition; and at this hour it is within measurable distance of this supreme victory.

In 1829 the Papacy, which had been stripped of its legislative powers by the Revolution settlement, was again admitted into the British Parliament. Since that year it has made rapid strides toward spiritual supremacy and temporal dominion in Great Britain.

(1) It has more than quadrupled its agencies; its priests; chapels; congregations; so that there is not a city or town—scarce is there a shire or a parish—that has not been under its influence, and been made a seat of its propaganda.

(2) This regular mechanism it has supplanted with a growing array of monasteries; nunneries; colleges; and schools. And in these last it is not the Roman Catholic youth alone that are being educated; thousands of Protestant children have been drawn into these seminaries; and are being prepared to swell the Popish population of the future.

(3) As if Rome's own action were not enough, we have come to her help by grafting a Popish ministration on every department of the public-service. Paid Popish chaplains are busy at work in our prisons; in our reformatories; in our workhouses; in

our army and navy. These various departments are being utilized for the conveyance of Romanism over the empire; and for the permeation of the body politic with an influence which, like a deadly poison, once received into the veins of a nation, inevitably kills it. The miracle of the Prophet has been reversed. When Elisha would restore the son of the Shunammite to life he stretched himself upon the body of the child, putting his mouth upon its mouth, his eyes upon its eyes, and his hands upon its hands. The Papacy has laid itself all along upon the body of the British empire—alas, not to breathe life but death into it!

(4) A regular hierarchy has been established in the three kingdoms. Canon law has been proclaimed. And there is not a Romanist in England, Scotland, or Ireland, who is not, through the Confessional, made amenable to Canon law, and ruled by it in his political and social acts, as well as in his religious duties. Canon law knows but one monarch; and to that monarch the undivided allegiance of every Romanist is due. This is an empire within an empire—if ever there was one.

(5) If the Papacy has created an *imperium in imperio* in the nation, it has planted a Parliament within a Parliament in the Legislature. A phalanx of eighty members represent it in the British House of Commons. There sits the Papacy under the shadow of the Speaker's chair. These eighty-four men—united; inscrutable; resolute; defiant—extort submission to their demands by the simple yet formidable expedient of obstruction. Through them the Vatican speaks and votes. It is the Pope's Parliament in the heart of

the Queen's Parliament; and the first strives for mastery over the last. So far the war has gone in its favor; for the Vaticanist party has made itself the master of the Cabinet; the terror of the Parliament; and largely the ruler of the nation.

(6) Moreover, Popish PROVINCIAL COUNCILS are of frequent occurrence. What is the function of these Councils? They concert plans of political action applicable to emergencies; and their resolutions, countersigned at Rome, are binding on all Romanists—who must act on the lines chalked out for them, whatever confusion or calamity their action may cause; and whatever penalty it may expose themselves to from the law of the land. The nation against whose peace and unity these intrigues are being formed knows nothing of it all the while, till some outbreak or explosion proclaims on the house-top what the Council had previously planned in secret.

(7) Of the many imperial honors conferred on the Papacy in our times, perhaps the most notable and astounding was the appointment of a Popish Viceroy to India. When we sent out the Marquis of Ripon, we sowed the dragon's teeth in that magnificent empire; and we have already begun to reap as we sowed. Lord Ripon was followed by a long train of bishops, priests, monks, nuns, and Jesuits. Popish dioceses were marked out; cathedrals erected; monastic institutions planted in several places; and seminary priests dispersed over the country. A few months after Lord Ripon's arrival Protestant missionaries were prevented from preaching in the open air at Calcutta; and peaceable congregations were dispersed. Indian so-

ciety was disturbed in a similar way to Ireland during Lord Ripon's Governor-Generalship; and the hand of the Jesuit is seen in the riots that continue to break out between the various religionists of India; and the disturbances are more likely to increase than abate.

THE IRISH FULCRUM.

(8) Ireland is still the main fulcrum on which the Papacy rests its lever, in its attempts to overturn the Protestant kingdom of Great Britain. The cherished policy of the Jesuits has ever been to keep Ireland ignorant; wretched; and agitated; to separate it from Great Britain; erect it into an independent kingdom under the rule of the Vatican; and to employ it for the destruction of British liberty and Protestantism. This scheme has already, twice over, been on the eve of accomplishment. It has been a third time revived, and more nearly carried to completion than on occasion of the two former attempts. There is now a pause, but the work of overthrowing "Protestant ascendancy" in Ireland will soon be again resumed. Protestant ascendancy in Ireland was defined by Mr. Gladstone to consist in three things: (1) the Established Protestant Church of Ireland; (2) the Protestant landlords of Ireland; (3) the Protestant education of Ireland. Great progress has of late been in the destruction of all three. The Irish Protestant Church, as an Establishment, has fallen. The Irish system of education has been revolutionized; and well-nigh wrecked. First, the Kildare schools were put down; next, the National schools and the Queen's colleges were denounced as Godless, and abandoned by the government—to be refashioned and refitted by the priest

hood. And, last of all, a Popish University was established, the effect of which has been to place the education of Ireland virtually in the power of a Popish conclave; and the schools in the hands of the "Christian brothers," who educate their pupils on the principles of the Syllabus—or, as Lord John Russell expressed it, "minister poison to the youth of Ireland as their daily food."

The most ominous part of this business is the changes which have been effected in our Statute Book. The whole legislation of the past five hundred years has been diligently searched; and not an Act or Statute which could offer the smallest hindrance to the advance of Popery to place and power in the State, but has been weeded out and swept away, or greatly modified. Upwards of forty Statutes of this character have been repealed. All the securities embodied in the Emancipation Act of 1829, with two exceptions (the Irish Viceroyalty, and the English woollack), have been abolished. All the securities in the Revolution settlement, with one exception, have been swept away. All offices under the Crown, with the two exceptions just mentioned, are now open to Romanists. The oath of the Royal Supremacy has been swept away. The Act of Settlement alone is left, the one barrier between us and a Popish reign. If that solitary Act were to share the fate of the others, we should speedily see a vassal of the Pope on the throne of Britain.*

[To be Continued.]

*The words "being Protestant" have been dropped from the oath of allegiance now sworn by members of Parliament. It is true that the 'Act of Settlement' restricts the succession to the crown to the heirs of Queen Victoria "being Protestant"; but the fact that all reference to this important limitation should have been quietly dropped from the oath of allegiance as now sworn shows in what direction the current is setting.

Cardinal Gibbons' Influence with President Cleveland.

President Cleveland has appointed Colonel John J. Coppinger, of the Eighteenth infantry, United States army, superintendent of the general recruiting service, with headquarters in New York city. Some surprise, says the *N. Y. Herald*, June 22, was expressed at this appointment by a Democratic President, in view of the fact that Colonel Coppinger is a son-in-law of Mr. James G. Blaine. But as Colonel Coppinger is a devoted Roman Catholic who drew his sword in defence of the Pope's temporal power, and against Garibaldi and the other emancipators of Italy, more than a quarter of a century ago, his appointment is doubtless due to the influence of Cardinal Gibbons over President Cleveland, which is said to be very great. The position of superintendent of the recruiting service in New York is almost a sinecure and consequently is eagerly sought after in army circles. Colonel Coppinger in New York will be a powerful agent of the Pope in all that concerns the interests of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States.

The Pope has a wise and wily agent in Cardinal Gibbons. He induced President Cleveland to attend the laying of the cornerstone of the new Catholic University at Washington, to which we referred last month. He compels political leaders to recognize the fact that the Pope has votes in the United States which "all political parties want," to repeat the words of Father Hecker. The supremacy of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States will be enforced some day, for such is evidently Rome's intention.


THE CHURCH OF ROME NOT THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

BY PAUL LE CLAIR.

VII.

Is the Head of the Papal Community, the Head of the Christian Church?

I.

UR intention here, is to prove that the Pope of Rome, who is the head of the Papal Community, or Church of Rome, *is not* the head of the Christian Church, by showing from the Word of God, that the only head of the Christian Church is the Lord Jesus Christ; and thus to proceed another step in establishing the general proposition: that, "the Church of Rome is not the Church of Christ." For, if the Church of Rome was the Church of Christ, the head of the Church of Rome, would be the head of the Church of Christ. But if we can prove that the Lord Jesus Christ, himself, is the King in Zion, and not the Pope of Rome, we shall go far in demonstrating that the subjects of his Holiness, are not, *as such*, the subjects of the Kingdom of Christ; but "aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise." (Eph. 2: 12).

2. The Church of Rome, the papists tell us, was founded by the Apostle Peter; and that he was the first pope, or universal bishop, in which See he presided twenty-five years. But, beside the tradition of Peter's martyrdom at Rome, in the first persecution (A. D. 64), there is no evidence that he was ever at Rome. For the Book of Acts, which was written to give an authentic account of the first progress of the Gospel, and especially of the Apostles Peter and Paul, does not mention Peter's being at Rome, while it records his la-

bors elsewhere. The Apostle Paul, in the numerous salutations to the more eminent members of the Church at Rome, sent in the sixteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, (verses 3—15), does not mention Peter as being at Rome, when he wrote that letter, (A. D. 58), or as having been the founder of a Church in that city. And when, afterwards, Paul went to Rome, (A. D. 61), where he remained two years, and from which city he wrote several epistles to other churches, in none of which does he mention Peter as being there with him. These facts are wholly unaccountable, if Peter founded the Church at Rome and was, for twenty-five years, its first bishop!

The last Scripture account we have of the Apostle Peter, represents him at Antioch, (A. D. 50 or 52, Gal. 2: 11). After this, he preached the Gospel in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bythania, and went to Rome, it is supposed, about the year 63, whence, a short time before his martyrdom, he wrote his two epistles.

The Scriptures do not inform us who first preached the Gospel, and planted the Church in Rome. It is probable, however, that those "strangers of Rome," who heard the Gospel preached in Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost, on their return, proclaimed the glad tidings to their fellow countrymen, and gathered the infant church in the great metropolis. (Acts. 2: 11).

3. The original form of government in the Church of Rome, was, doubtless, the same as that of other primitive

Christian societies. And the Scriptures clearly represent the ordinary and permanent office-bearers of a Christian church, to be the pastor or bishop, the ruling elders, and the deacons. A Scriptural bishop had the care of one assembly or church, which, frequently, was small enough to be accommodated in a private house. *In the government* of the church, he was associated with the ruling elders; and in *the care of the poor*, the pastor and elders were aided by the deacons.*

Thus, at the establishment of Christianity, every particular church, or body of believers, when fully organized, had its own pastor, or bishop, ruling elders, and deacons. And each of these office-bearers enjoyed a perfect official equality with all others of the same rank; while the only known and acknowledged Head of the Universal Church, was the Lord Jesus Christ, the Great Shepherd of the sheep. (Col. 1: 18; Heb. 13: 20).

4. This Apostolic constitution of the Church continued until about the middle of the second century, when a gradual change in church government began to appear. As the congregations in the larger cities increased in opulence, their pastors, under the seducing influence of prosperity, began to lose the humility and zeal of their predecessors, and to assume superiority over their brethren in more obscure situations. The following century witnessed a further development of the bishops "after the order of Diotrephes," (3 John 9). As pastors of single congregations became bishops of dioceses, so archbishops and patriarchs claimed jurisdiction over provinces and kingdoms.

5. In the fourth and fifth centuries,

*Mos. Ecc. Hist. p. 4 to 22.

the patriarchs of Rome, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Antioch, and Constantinople, were the generally acknowledged heads of the visible Catholic Church, living in luxury, and exercising the lordly privilege of convening councils, and presiding in those assemblies. In process of time, a strife for sole supremacy arose among these five great "lords over God's heritage;" which was soon reduced to a contest between Rome and Constantinople, the respective capitals of the Latin and Greek empires. For a brief space, Constantinople was successful in the person of John IV., the pastor, who was recognized as ecumenical bishop by the council of Constantinople. His assumption of supremacy, however, was sternly rebuked by Gregory, bishop of Rome, who denounced such assumption as a mark of the forerunner of Anti-Christ. In this unholy strife, however, the final triumph was achieved by Rome. For, Boniface III., the successor of Gregory, (A. D. 606), secured the much coveted prize of universal supremacy, by the assistance and authority of the emperor, Phocas, who had violently seized the throne of the Greek empire. (A. D. 602). And thus, aided by the usurper of a temporal crown, Pope Boniface became the successful usurper of the spiritual crown of the visible Church, the purchased and exclusive right of Christ, the eternal king!

6. This claim of the bishop of Rome to universal supremacy in the Church, has been advanced and maintained to the present time. It was affirmed and defined by the council of Florence, 1439; by the council of Trent, in its authorized Catechism, in which it is declared, that the Pope, "sitting in that

chair in which Peter, the prince of the Apostles, sat to the close of life, the Catholic (Roman) Church recognizes in his person the most exalted degree of dignity, and the full amplitude of jurisdiction."

In the year 1842, Bishop Kenrick of Philadelphia, addressed to the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, a letter on "Christian Union." In that letter, the vicar of the Pope extended a cordial invitation to the Protestant Prelates, to unite with his church, which he represented as "resting in immovable firmness on the rock of Papal supremacy," and, "in harmony of faith and obedience, gathering around that rock, as the essential centre of unity." At a later period, 1870, there was added to the claim of *Papal Supremacy*, the dogma of *Papal Infallibility*.

7. Beyond question, therefore, the Pope is the sovereign head of the Roman ecclesiastical community. And beyond question, that community, like every other self-constituted, human association, has the natural right to adopt a constitution, creating a form of self-government, and designating the officers by whom that government shall be administered, etc. All this, we cheerfully concede, but in making this concession, we utterly deny the right of Rome to exercise jurisdiction beyond her own pale—and we deny, too, the right of Rome, as an *ecclesiastical* society, to abide or in any way, intermeddle with the *civil right* of even her own adherents. Much more must we protest against the false pretence of Rome to be *what she is not*. Rome is Rome, and nothing else—"the mother of harlots and of the abominations of the earth." (Rev. 17: 5). How shameless the audacity, then for Rome to pre-

tend to be "*The Church of the Living God!*"

We have seen conclusively, that the sovereign head of the Church of Rome, is the Pope. But who is the sovereign head of the Church of Christ?

Good and Kind Letters.

GUADALAJARA, Mexico, June 16, 1888.
MY DEAR BROTHER :

Some time ago I ordered your magazine through Rev. John Howland. THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC is a grand publication, exceedingly valuable to missionaries in Papal countries. The bound volumes which I purchased are admirable. I would not do without them for double their cost. May God long spare your life, fill your heart with love for perishing souls, your head with sound ideas regarding the truth of God and your pocket with means to carry on the good word.

D. A. WILSON,

Director Baptist Mission.

MY DEAR BROTHER :—Your last issue of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC has thrilled me with its tokens of God's blessing on your work. Go on with your advocacy of "pure and undefiled religion," and may the Lord Jesus open the eyes of multitudes now blinded by the abominable superstitions of Rome. I am glad you expose the folly of Protestants who dally with the scarlet beast.

There is no publication whose perusal affords me more pleasure and profit than yours. This is saying a good deal, for I am a subscriber to several papers and magazines.

Yours Truly, N. W.

FATHER O'CONNOR'S LETTERS TO CARDINAL GIBBONS.

LETTER XXII.

NEW YORK, July 14, 1888.

SIR:—Eighteen months ago when Father Edward McGlynn was summoned to Rome to explain why he dared to rebel against ecclesiastical authority as represented by Cardinal Simeoni, the Pope's secretary, nearly all Catholics urged him to go, and a great many Protestants who are ignorant of the ways of your Church said it would be best for him to obey his ecclesiastical superiors. He could tell the Pope, they said, that he had done nothing wrong, that he had merely exercised his right as an American citizen to speak and vote as he pleased for any political party that was regularly organized. I said at the time, and I was almost alone in my prediction that he would not go to Rome, because he knew, as I did, that he would not be fairly treated there; but that he would be punished and prevented from ever speaking again as a free American citizen. He should be a Roman priest, a slave to "ecclesiastical authority," under the thumb of such men—"creatures," millions of Catholics now call them—as Archbishop Corrigan and Cardinal Simeoni. Later I published Father McGlynn's declaration in his letter to Archbishop Corrigan, dated January 11, 1887, "I WILL NOT GO TO ROME." He had been previously suspended for a brief period for delivering an address that threatened extinction to the political party to which the great majority of Irish Roman Catholics in New York rendered slavish obedience. Immediately after his refusal to go to Rome he was permanently suspended and "clubbed out" of his parish, where he had faithfully ministered for twenty-five years to the largest congregation in the world. A few months later (July, 1887), he was formally excommunicated—"released" he called it.

Since that time he has made good use of his liberty in denouncing the iniquities of your Church in more than a hundred public speeches, not only in New York but in the chief cities of the country. Not until Sunday, July 8, 1888, however, has he given to the public an inside view of what awaited him at Rome if he had gone there.

In his address to a large number of his former parishioners that filled the great hall of Cooper Union, New York, on that day he said:

The Sacred Roman and Universal Inquisition may condemn us, but they condemned Copernicus and Galileo, and yet the solar system is wagging on in blissful ignorance that the Inquisition ever had any quarrel with it. We may as well inject this little parenthesis right here; it is a very great mistake for any of us to magnify that institution. We should go straight ahead, not bothering our heads about it. The whole world is magnifying the Inquisition and the "diplomacy" of the Pope. The proper thing is to go straight ahead and pay no attention to his diplomacy, to treat it with utter indifference. That is the only way to do. I do not want to boast of it at all, but I think I have been able to avoid a very serious mistake by ignoring that institution. "Ah," some may say, "there is one thing, Father McGlynn's great mistake was that he did not go to Rome."

Of course we are in sympathy with him, of course we know that he is right, but why didn't he go Rome to explain things and there defend himself, and then come back with flying colors, and all would have been right." (Great laughter and applause.)

My friends, you who talk that way don't know what you are talking about. I am more than half a Roman myself. You know I was "caught very young." I was only a boy, barely fourteen years old, when I went to that eternal city, and I remained there till I was twenty-three years old. Those nine years are about the best nine years of any man or woman's life. And I learned the Italian language so that even now I can make a stump speech in Italian without any preparation. And being as I think not entirely unobservant and not being entirely destitute of the philosophical faculty, I must have taken a good many mental notes during my nine years there, and although somewhat a taciturn boy, I was like the Irishman's parrot, that was not a parrot at all but an owl, and if I did not say much "agin the government," faith I kept up a good deal of thinking. (Laughter and applause.) You know the old story is that somebody had imposed upon our poor friend by giving him or selling him as a parrot what was only a miserable, stupid old owl. He did his best by all manner of endearments to teach what he thought was a parrot to speak. And his acquaintances, wiser than he, had great fun inquiring as to the success of his attempt at the education of the parrot, and when they would ask: "Well, does the parrot speak much yet?" he would answer: "No, he does not speak a word, but he keeps up a power of thinking." (Laughter.)

And didn't Galileo go to Rome and they ordered him to be brought to Rome in chains, because they had a most beautiful understanding with the prince who had robbed Florence and Tuscany of its liberties. Those princes were for a large part of the time nephews and cousins of the Pope, and with the aid of many soldiers and excommunications they used to reduce the people to servitude, to subjection to the cousin, brother or nephew. And so the man that was ruling Tuscany and Florence was ordered to send Galileo in chains to Rome for teaching what he saw in God's book in the Heavens. And didn't he give them mathematical demonstration? Yes, and those old fellows would say: "We can't see it." (Laughter and applause.) I am not caricaturing, I am only actually drawing now from a somewhat retentive memory images of those "assessors" of the Inquisition, the Dominican monks. They said substantially in this very voice and tone and manner, although they said it in Latin and I translate it: "Mr. Galileo, you say that the sun stands in the centre of the solar system, and you say that this earth is but a little planet revolving around it. Now you are contradicting the Scriptures. The Scriptures say that the earth moves. You are a heretic." That was the end of it. "The Scripture says the earth stands. The Scripture says that the sun rises and sets. You say it is not the sun that rises and sets, but the earth turning around. You are a heretic." He says: "Well, of course you know that the Scripture only speaks in metaphor." "But it says *stat*, stands. You are not a theologian, you have no business to explain it, you must obey." "Oh, I know I am not a theologian, but if I see something in na-

ture—surely one truth cannot contradict another.” “That’s what we say. Science must conform to the word of God.” (Laughter.)

Some of you imagine Dr. McGlynn going into the Vatican, and some one comes and says: “Who are you, sir?” “Here’s my card, I am Dr. McGlynn.” “Oh, the Holy Father has been expecting you, in fact, he wondered why you didn’t come sooner.” And he goes up and knocks at the door of the Pope’s room and says: “Here is Dr. McGlynn.” “Show him up” says the Pope. Then Dr. McGlynn comes up and sees the Pope, who says: “We must have a proper hearing and discussion of this matter, come around at ten o’clock to-morrow morning.” The next day the Pope assembles thirty-six cardinals and fifty six Dominican monks and the stage will be brilliantly set and Dr. McGlynn would come in and make his bow to the Pope and cardinals and begin exactly after the manner of Edwin Booth or Salvini in *Othello* in his address to the doge and senators: “Most potent, grave, and reverend signors.” (Laughter.) And then Dr. McGlynn would make a passionate speech for an hour or two, and all would be convinced. “If that is so, it’s all right; we entirely misunderstood you. And now go back. Here’s our blessing. Tell the archbishop to keep quiet now.” That may be your imagination of it.

Now what will be the reality? Dr. McGlynn would go there. The first thing he would have to do would be to have his head shaved on the top. (Laughter.) He would have to hire a barber to shave the top of his head in order to be in proper ecclesiastical condition. Then he would have to put a kind of overall or cloak over his gown. Then he would have to buy a three-cornered hat to make him look more foolish than even nature does. And then he would have to go to the Propaganda and wait there two, three, four, five or six hours in the ante-chamber of Cardinal Simeoni. And some little monsignor’s secretary would send out word that he was too busy and could not see him, and, when getting up off his stool, some little fellow would come up and say: “Well, sir, what is it?” And he would give him his name. “Oh, you are the fellow, are you, who disobeyed your archbishop and showed yourself an unworthy child of the Propaganda, so recreant to all your opportunities; so you are he who gave such a bad example, and caused such scandals to Holy Church? You knew our wishes and failed to carry them out. Now we have sent for you in order to compel you to obey. You must retract, repent, obey, and atone for the scandal you have given.” Some little underling would tell me that. And then if I got an audience of Cardinal Simeoni (I never would get near enough to the Pope, even if I felt any great desire to do it, to kiss his foot), perhaps after the first audience in which I should be thus objugated, I would be told to go off to a monastery to make a retreat for a month or two to “purge” myself and “purify” myself in order to put myself into anything like proper spiritual conditions, to be crawling on my knees before them to let them kick me. And I would say: “But, but, your eminence, I was trying to do the best I could; it was not for the fun of the thing, but for the poor people of the Irish league.” “That was none of your business; there was an archbishop to think about that. The idea of a priest having any ideas on the subject whatsoever contrary to those of his archbishop!” “But some of the people were

turning against the Church because the Church was turning against them." "That is the accursed spirit of liberalism that you have been doing so much to foment, which it was your duty as a Propagandist to do your best to prevent."

Now what would be the use of my arguing with men like that? Ah! In more senses than one the proper thing for me and for you to do with Cardinal Simeoni and with the Pope and with the Propaganda and the "Sacred Inquisition," as far as they are abusing their authority, as a mere machine to crush out liberty, to prevent national development, to retard the growth of science—the proper thing in more senses than one for us to do is to "leave them to God;" because there is very little use in our bothering with them. We are not going to convert them to anything like a rational modern view of seeing things. Another reason for leaving them entirely in God's hands is that He is about the only one able to do full justice to them. (Applause.) And I do not think it any very great affectation for me to say, dear friends, that, is altogether too big a contract for me to undertake to reform the political side of the Vatican and the Propaganda and the doings of the ecclesiastical machine as distinct from the Church of Christ, which doings have been going on for a thousand years or more. Nobody but God in this overruling providence, shaping the destinies of nations and the events and the conflicts of man, can do full justice to that subject, and it is my abiding faith that He is going to do it. (Applause.)

Do you know the proper kind of argument to convince these people or their successors of the next generation or the generation after that, the argument that is going to convince them and liberalize them? It is the rebellion of the Catholic people of the earth who will rise in their might and protest against Papal diplomacy and Papal interference in politics, who will refuse to give any more Peter's pence, and show up this humbug and sham of the "prisoner in the Vatican"—a prisoner with four thousand rooms and twenty-two court-yards, and a garden like a park in which to ride, with all Italy and Europe and the world to travel in, and plenty of money to hire a whole steamship for himself if he wants to. When the Catholic peoples shall become sick and tired of all this stuff and there shall be much fewer priests and monks in Italy, because there won't be any temporal attractions to draw them into the Church, religion will be something better for them than it is now. And the world, taught by the experience of fifteen hundred years, largely of shame and crime, because of the mistakes made by endowing the Church with kingdoms and temporal power, will be on its guard against the Papacy.

Father McGlynn might have added the words of our Lord regarding His Church: "My Kingdom is not of this world." The Pope's kingdom is of this world, and it is hastening to its ruin.

Yours truly,

JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

FATHER O'CONNOR'S LETTERS TO CARDINAL GIBBONS.

LETTER XXIII.

NEW YORK, July 20, 1888.

SIR: Three months ago, Monsignor Leon Bouland, an eminent French ecclesiastic, renounced your Church in this city, and in June was received into the Protestant Episcopal Church by Bishop Potter. He had been a Roman Catholic priest in France and in this country. What he has to say regarding your Church will be read with interest. From the *Forum* magazine for July, I take the following article. Should you reply to him I shall be happy to publish your statement.

ROMANISM AND THE REPUBLIC.

BY MONSIGNOR LEON BOULAND.

"Let us be Catholics," said Bossuet, "but let us be Gallicans." It is in the spirit of this great French preacher that I, a Frenchman by birth and education, would presume to offer a brief criticism upon the Roman Church and its relations to the American republic. Let us be Catholics, but let us be Americans. But is it possible to be at the same time loyal Roman Catholics and loyal American citizens? I believe that it is not, and shall endeavor, in the following pages, to give the reasons underlying this belief. "If the liberties of the American people are ever destroyed, it will be by the hands of the Roman clergy." These are the words of another French Catholic, a man even greater than Bossuet, and one to whom the American people gladly acknowledge an everlasting debt of deep gratitude; a man who did more, perhaps, than any other single individual, not an American, to win the political independence and secure the national freedom which this country now enjoys. But what grounds were there for such a prophecy? When Lafayette spoke these words there seemed to be nothing whatever in the actual state of things to give them warrant. The Roman hierarchy was very weak and very poor in these United States, and the churches were, for the most part, small missionary stations widely scattered over an almost boundless territory. Power and influence it had none; but it had a system which Lafayette knew well, and he saw in that system a potency which he had done so much to establish with his treasure and his sword.

Lafayette knew this system of old. He had seen it in his well-beloved France as a mighty serpent, coiling itself around the national life and choking out the liberties of the people. This monster serpent, Ultramontanism, had crawled up out of the deep, dark Roman sea many years before, and, as in the case of the loyal Trojan priest Laocoon, had wound itself around the Gallican priest at the altar, and was slowly but surely strangling the priest and his faithful children, the sons of France. Many true Catholics, such as Bossuet, had seen the danger and escaped the coils of the great Vatican reptile. But Bossuet was gone; liberty was gone; and Rome and anarchy were fighting over the spoils of the French nation. To change the figure, Lafayette saw in these small missionary

stations the outposts of the Roman army, whose well-trained legions might ere long be in absolute possession of the whole land. It was the system that he feared, and it is the system, I think, that we should fear; for not to fear too often means not to be ready when the danger is near. No native-born American could have seen danger where Lafayette saw it. No one but a Roman Catholic born and brought up in a Roman Catholic country, could possibly have seen any danger to the American republic in the few missionary priests whom the Roman Church had sent over to the New World in such a modest guise. The Americans who heard the warning words of Lafayette did not, I imagine, take them seriously; but, on the contrary, they probably laughed within themselves at such groundless fears, just as Americans to-day laugh when they are asked to give any serious attention to the dangers which appear to me to threaten this fair land from a system known as "Ultramontanism, or Jesuitism."

A good-natured contempt of such danger seems almost universal among the citizens of this great republic. I do not like the role of an alarmist, but I believe I see danger ahead, and am willing to expose myself to some ridicule in the hope of arousing my fellow-citizens to a sense of the danger which, as I believe, threatens the American nation from the Roman Church. If the note of alarm is ever sounded, it must be, I think, by some one less optimistic than the typical American; by one, in fact, who knows the Roman system, and how it has operated and is operating in other countries for the enslavement of the people.

Look about you and see what the few poor missionary stations, in which Lafayette saw cause for alarm, have become. Behold the innumerable churches, cathedrals, monasteries, nunneries, seminaries, colleges, and universities which cover the American continent from east to west, and from north to south. See the army of priests, bishops, archbishops, and cardinals, all thoroughly trained, under the most perfect discipline, and swearing implicit obedience—to the Constitution of the American republic? No. Swearing obedience, in all things temporal and spiritual, to an Italian pontiff, who lives in Rome and issues his orders from a palace called the Vatican. Leo XIII. sits in the Vatican at Rome, and commands his army of priests and prelates in America and Ireland with as much absolute authority as any Cæsar ever commanded his loyal legions in their subjugation of the nations of the earth. Lafayette saw but a few straggling outposts; we see the mighty army in solid column with banners flying, marching, with firm step and steady eye, conquering and to conquer. But some one may say that there is nothing to be feared from any number, however great and powerful, of Roman Catholic priests; that these ministers of religion, with all their church institutions, are blessings, not curses, to this country; that they are the conservators and guardians of law and order, rather than a danger to the peace and safety of the liberties of the people. Morally speaking, that is true, in a certain sense. The Roman Church may be a powerful check upon certain forms of vice and immorality. It is, perhaps, the only church which exercises any positive control over the dangerous classes. But is not this a comparative rather than a positive blessing? Is it a matter for which the Roman Church

can justly claim any great credit? Is it not fair to ask why it is that the great majority of the dangerous classes are subject to the control of the Roman Church? Is it not because they are her own children, the products of her system, if not of her teaching? Examine the police records of this or any other great American city, and I think you will find that at least seventy-five per cent. of the criminals are of Roman Catholic parentage. Is it then, unreasonable to expect that the Roman Church should exert some restraining influence over her own followers?

Again, granted that the Roman Catholic Church has control over the vicious classes, is it not possible that such control might be used against the liberties of this country? Before considering that question let me say that I have no reason to doubt that the great majority of Roman Catholic priests in America mean to be, and believe themselves to be, good citizens of this republic. But they belong to a system in which free agency is impossible. They are members of an army in which the strictest discipline is enforced, and the most prompt and perfect obedience is required. The commander-in-chief of this Roman army is naturally and most fittingly a Roman, not an American. What does the Pope of Rome care for the blessings of American liberty or American citizenship? These things, in fact, stand in the way of his ambition for universal conquest, and must be sacrificed. The ambition of the pope, whoever he may be, is, always has been, and ever must be, universal conquest. In taking command of the Roman Church he takes this oath. The Vatican claims absolute and supreme authority in all things temporal as well as spiritual; and every priest, bishop, archbishop, and cardinal throughout the world takes an oath of perfect submission and obedience to the pope as his supreme lord and master in all things. This being true—and let any priest or bishop affirm that it is not—is it not quite certain that the priest, whatever his private or personal opinion and feelings may be as an American citizen, must support the church, as against the state, at all times and under all circumstances? He has clearly no choice whatever, but is under positive command which may not be disregarded in the slightest particular. Witness the case of the distinguished priest, the late pastor of St. Stephen's Roman Catholic Church, New York. He was not permitted even the small privilege, as an American citizen, of being present at a political meeting of which his superiors did not approve. Do we not see, then, that the personal intentions and feelings of the Roman priest, however good, count for nothing when we are considering the attitude of the Roman church toward the state?

Again, that there may be no seeming reflection upon the patriotism of the Roman Catholic priest as a man and as an American citizen, I am quite willing to believe that the great body of priests not only have no wish to interfere with the liberties of the American people, but really have no idea that the Roman Church can or ever will attempt to overthrow the Constitution of this republic. But these priests are under absolute masters. And the time may come when they shall receive orders to march against the freedom of a republic in which they were born, and which they love, but which must ever be subordinate to the interests of the Vatican. They belong to a system, and that system is anti-repub-

ican, anti-American, anti-everything that is meant by freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and especially freedom of our public schools. Freedom of conscience is almost the first principle of the American Constitution. The American nation sprang from loins of men who suffered persecution for conscience sake. The American Constitution says that all men shall be free to worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences. The Vatican says liberty of conscience is "a pest, of all others most to be dreaded in a state." It is hardly necessary, I imagine, for me to enlarge upon this point, as all who know anything about the Roman Church know perfectly well that "heresy," according to that church, is the greatest of all crimes, greater than murder or adultery. Free speech and a free press are also among the fundamental principles of the American republic. But nothing is more offensive to Rome. Where she has the power of control she has never tolerated, and she never will tolerate, either free speech or a free press. The Czar of Russia is not more autocratic and dictatorial than the pope in proscribing free speech and the freedom of the press.

The unrelenting opposition of the Roman Church to the public-school system is in itself sufficient cause for alarm. The hate which this foreign power bears our public schools is not disguised. In most things the Roman hierarchy assumes a modest bearing. It does not boast of its power. It does not proclaim its strength. Its policy is for the most part, to work quietly, in the hope of not attracting too much attention, until it shall be ready to assert its authority and enforce its decrees. But in discussing the public-school question there is no pretence of modesty or toleration. In this one matter, at least, the issue is already clearly drawn. The policy of compromise and indirection is here thrown off. The Roman Church will no longer treat with the state upon this subject. She will accept no terms but an unconditional surrender. The orders have gone forth from the Vatican, and the war upon our public schools has begun. Rome knows that so long as the youth of America are educated in our public schools she cannot hope to wrest authority from the hands of the state. It has always been Rome's wise policy to look after the education of the children—*i.e.*, if they must be educated—until they are thoroughly taught obedience to the church, and obedience to the church is by far the most important, if not the only important, item in a Roman Catholic education. This lesson of obedience cannot be easily taught if the child is allowed to attend the public schools, where loyalty to the republic and obedience to her laws are learned as the first duties of American citizenship. The Roman Church aims at universal supremacy in things temporal as well as in things spiritual. There can be no doubt about this, and I think no one will rise up and dispute it. Bishop Gilmour, of Cleveland, has written as follows: "Nationalities must be subordinate to religion" (meaning, of course, the Roman Catholic Church), "and we must learn that we are Catholics first and citizens next." The late Cardinal McCloskey, of New York, said that "Catholics in this republic are as strongly devoted to the sustenance and maintenance of the temporal power of the Holy Father as Catholics in any other part of the world; and if it should be necessary to prove it by acts, they are ready to

do so."

These bishops speak as men having authority. Is one, then, to be laughed at as an alarmist for sounding out a note of warning, when bishops and cardinals, representing a vast army of ten millions of communicants, speak out against the Constitution of the republic in such threatening words?

In this contest with the public schools the Roman Church is quite willing to accept any aid, from any source, and to enter into any alliance. History teaches that Rome has never hesitated to accept aid from any quarter in order to further her own ends. The "Freeman's Journal" very politely invited its good friends, the Methodist Episcopal clergy, during their recent general conference in this city, to join with the Roman Catholics in closing the doors of the public schools. That point once gained, closing the doors of the Methodist Episcopal and all other heretical churches would follow in due course and in the natural order of things. The *Catholic Review* speaks out upon this subject in the frankest possible manner. This is what it says: "Protestantism of every form has not, and never can have, any right where Catholicity"—i. e., the Roman Church—"is triumphant." Let "Catholicity," so called, be once "triumphant" in abolishing the public schools of the United States, and other triumphs would speedily follow.

Are such utterances in accord with the letter or the spirit of the American Constitution? If so, I have not read it understandingly. But the American people will not, it seems, be convinced that there is anything whatever to fear, so long as force is not used. They will not look at the subject at all, and are impatient at having it brought before them in public speech or in the public press. But one cannot avert a danger by refusing to see it. Is it quite certain that this country is wholly free from dangers that threaten other nations of the world? The Roman Catholic vote has already become so important an element in politics as to decide the fate of parties. Every Roman Catholic is in duty bound to enter politics as a Roman Catholic, not as an American citizen. The press of this country understands perfectly well that if it would have the support of the Roman Catholics it must say nothing in criticism, but everything in praise, of the Roman Church; so that even now there is a practical restraint, if not a positive check, upon the freedom of the press.

The American people, with a heroism unparalleled in history, threw off the yoke of political dependence, and have made themselves a mighty nation, founded upon freedom of conscience, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press. These liberties are essential to the maintenance and perpetuity of this republic. But there is a church organization in this nation which is, and ever must be, in deadly conflict with these principles of liberty. The Roman hierarchy is the most complete and powerful instrument of absolutism and tyranny the world has ever known. It holds within its mighty grasp all government, civil and religious, and all interests, temporal as well as spiritual. That the Vatican claims temporal power in Rome, goes without saying; and that she makes the same claim in the United States, I think I have proven out of the mouth of a bishop and a cardinal-archbishop. I take it that every one acquainted with the facts would readily agree that there can be no such thing as republican government where

the decrees of the Vatican are enforced. It is then simply a question of power. The Roman Church claims, in fact to be a theocracy, and true to this idea she enforces, when she can, obedience to her authority in all things social, political, and economic, as well as in things religious, so called. Has she not, within the past few weeks, asserted this political power in Ireland in the most positive and high-handed manner? Can there be any question as to the meaning of the Vatican rescript, coming as it does in the midst of a fierce struggle of an oppressed people for political liberty? Does it not mean that the temporal interests of nationalities and governments, of races and peoples, must at all times be sacrificed to the policy of the Roman Pontiff? The Irish bishops accept the pope's rescript without question, and declare that the Roman pontiff has an inalienable divine right to speak with authority on all such matters. Do Americans think that this republic is absolutely and forever invulnerable, and free from any possible danger from within or without? Strong nations fear the Roman system. Two of the greatest statesmen of this age have spoken out in plain, grave speech upon the pretensions of the Roman Church. Mr. Gladstone says:

"The pope demands for himself the right to determine the province of his own rights, and has so defined it in formal documents as to warrant any and every invasion of the civil sphere. . . . Rome requires a convert who joins her to forfeit his moral and mental freedom, and to place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another."

Prince Bismarck, in a speech delivered April 16, 1875, said:

"This pope, this foreigner, this Italian, is more powerful in this country than any one person, not excepting even the king. And now please to consider what this foreigner has announced as the programme by which he rules in Prussia as elsewhere. He begins by arrogating to himself the right to define how far his authority extends. And this pope, who would use fire and sword against us if he had the power to do so, who would confiscate our property and not spare our lives, expects us to allow him full, uncontrolled sway among us."

Yours truly,

JAMES A. O'CONNOR.

FINE PRINTING.

"No Sunday in the Bible," is the title of a pamphlet of 30 pages, that has been recently printed at the "CONVERTED CATHOLIC" office. The author, Mr. Henry McKinney, Great Bend, Pa., says the printing is an excellent piece of work, finer even than the Magazine itself, good as it is. We solicit the printing of pamphlets, tracts, etc. Our rates are very moderate.

"Ireland and the Pope," is the title of a volume of 118 pages which gives a "History of Papal Intrigues against Irish Liberty from Adrian IV., to Leo XIII." The author is Judge James G. Maguire, of the Superior Court of San Francisco, California. It is published by James H. Barry 429 Montgomery Street San Francisco, Cal., price 50 cents. It is a good sign of the times when Catholics attack the Papacy as in this volume.